UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,421	04/08/2004	Chih-Ho Chiu	250913-1190	7827

24504 7590 02/16/2006

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER	
FINEMAN, LEE A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2872	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/820,421	CHIU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lee Fineman	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 4 November 2005 in which claims 1, 15 and 18 were amended. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 7, lines 14-15, "dielectric layers 210" should be --dielectric layers 220--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: The newly amended claims now state "A transmissive wire grid polarizer with double metal layers **for visible spectrum**..." However, this statement is grammatically incorrect. The examiner suggests --for use in the visible spectrum--.

The dependent claims inherit the deficiencies of the claims from which they depend. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-16, 18, 19, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhaoning Yu et al. (*CLEO '99*).

Regarding claims 1, 6-9, 12-15 and 18 Yu et al. disclose in fig. 1 a single embodiment of a transmissive wire grid polarizer with double metal layers (see paragraphs 3 and 4, in so far as if only 54% of the TM light is reflected, some of the rest of the light must be transmitted and some must be absorbed), comprising: a transparent substrate (silica); an array of parallel and elongated dielectric protrusions (of PMMA) on the transparent substrate, wherein the dielectric protrusions have a period (190 nm) and a trench is located between adjacent dielectric layers; a first metal layer (of Au and Cr) having a first thickness (75 nm combined thickness of metal) in the trench; and a second metal layer (of Au and Cr) having a second thickness (75 nm combined thickness of metal) and a width (70 nm) on each dielectric protrusion, wherein the first and second metal layers are separated by a vertical distance of 125 nm [200 nm minus the 75 nm thickness of the first metal layer; it is clear from the present disclosure that the "vertical spacing" is measured between the top of the first metal layer and the bottom of the second metal layer]; wherein the period (190 nm) is in a range of 10 ~ 250 nm; wherein the first thickness (75 nm) is in the range of 30 – 150 nm and is equal to the second thickness; and wherein the ratio of the width (70 nm) to the period (190 nm) is in the range of 25 ~ 75% (36.8%). Thus, Yu et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Yu et al. disclose a vertical spacing of 125 nm rather than 100 nm, as recited. Turning to the second to the last paragraph of their disclosure, Yu et al. discuss having performed additional experiments wherein the vertical spacing was varied. Yu et

al. teach that the vertical spacing is a variable affecting the polarizing performance of the structure, and demonstrate that variation of the spacing is a matter of routine experimentation.

Barring any *unexpectedly* improved result arising out of the particular selection of a vertical spacing not greater than 100 nm, it appears that one of ordinary skill would have arrived at such a spacing through only routine experimentation and optimization manipulating the resonance between grating layers and concomitant polarization dependence, as suggested by Yu et al.

With regard to claims 2, 16, 19, and 22, Yu et al. disclose a dielectric layer thickness of 200 nm, and disclose the distance from the bottom of the first metal layer to the bottom of the second metal layer as being 200 nm. Thus, it is clear that the dielectric layer has been patterned (by nanoimprint, beginning with a lithographic step) all the way down to the substrate, such that the substrate is exposed (to the first metal layer) in the trenches.

4. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. (*CLEO '99*) in view of Garvin et al. (US 4,289,381).

As set forth above for claims 1 and 18, Yu et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Yu et al. do not disclose a particular substrate thickness (claims 4-5), and do not disclose a protective layer (claims 10-11, and 21).

In the same field of endeavor, Garvin et al. disclose a wire grid polarizer with double metal layers. Garvin et al. teach that the substrate should be chosen so as to be invisible (transparent) to the wavelengths of interest and of a thickness capable of supporting the overlying grid ("on the order of a few mils" for the substrate chosen), and further suggest a

protective layer of "substrate material" atop the last metal layer for additional thermal mass and passivation of the upper layer.

With regard to claims 4 and 5, barring any *unexpectedly* improved result, it appears that one of ordinary skill would have arrived at a thickness in the range of 0.5 to 1.5 mm, through only routine experimentation and optimization, since Garvin et al. teach that selection of a substrate thickness is a matter of routine experimentation.

With particular regard to claim 5, Yu et al. disclose a silica wafer as the substrate, but do not disclose the silica as being amorphous (glassine). However, silica glass was well known to be a suitable substrate for optical gratings, and was often selected for its relative abundance and lower cost. Thus, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to substitute silica glass for the silica wafer of Yu et al., since glass would have been cheaper than a high-purity quartz (silica) wafer.

With regard to claims 10, 11, and 21, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide a protective layer of substrate material over the grating of Yu et al., in the interest of improving the thermal performance of the assembly through increased thermal mass, as fairly suggested by Garvin et al., and in the interest of passivating the metal layers from oxidation that would degrade the polarizer performance, as fairly suggested by Garvin et al.

With particular regard to claim 11, the substrate material of Yu et al. is SiO_2 (silica), however, it appears that selection of any of the recited materials would have been an obvious matter of selection a suitable material based upon it thermal characteristics, or transparency, as suggested by Garvin et al.

5. Claims 3, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. (*CLEO '99*), in view of J.J. Kuta et al. (*JOSA A*).

As set forth above with respect to claims 1, 15, and 18, Yu et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Yu et al. do not disclose a remaining dielectric layer formed on the bottom of the trench.

In the same field of endeavor, Kuta et al. discuss polarizing response metal grating lines disposed in a vacuum (self-supporting) as contrasted with metal grating lines disposed on various substrate materials. Kuta et al. teach that the choice of material immediately adjacent the metal features changes the Rayleigh resonances and thus changes the polarizing response of the grating (see for example, section 4). Thus, Kuta et al. fairly identify the material immediately adjacent the grating lines as a result-effective variable.

Barring any *unexpectedly* improved result, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide a thickness of the dielectric layer (PMMA) remaining in the bottom of the trenches of Yu et al., in the interest of providing a material of different refractive index immediately adjacent the metal grating layer, since Kuta et al. fairly suggest that selection of the adjacent material is a matter of routine experimentation in optimizing the polarizing performance of the grating.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yu et al. fails to teach a transmissive polarizer for use in the visible spectrum. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the polarizer does reflect about 54% of the TM light in the visible spectrum (see paragraphs 3-4 of Yu) some of the rest of the light must be transmitted and some must be absorbed, making it at least in part a transmissive polarizer.

Regarding the applicants' conclusion that the substrate of Yu et al. "cannot be transparent" because the polarizer of Yu et al. is a reflective polarizer, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the last action, it does not matter that **the aggregate structure** of Yu et al. is reflective. The claim recites the transparency of the substrate **alone**, and does so without even specifying an operative wavelength region. Transparency of the substrate is an inherent optical characteristic. In this case, silica is known to be transparent over the visible range of wavelengths, and notably, is transparent over the range of wavelengths used by Yu et al.

Finally, the applicant again argues that smaller vertical spacings achieving higher transmittance and higher extinction ratios are unexpected results. The examiner respectfully disagrees. First, it is well known that light traveling through a material will have better efficiency when the material is thinner. Secondly, as stated in the last office action, the examiner believes that the behavior of the Yu et al. grating is readily predicted using a rigid coupled wave analysis or Maxwell's equations (rather than scalar diffraction), and as such is quite predictable. The fact that Yu et al. use their grating in reflection such that one extinction ratio is observed, does not lead the examiner to conclude that the grating behavior in transmission (where Applicants observe a greater extinction ratio) would be at all "unexpected," as urged by Applicants. Moreover, since the construction of the Yu et al. grating so nearly resembles Applicants' construction, the examiner has reasonable belief that, had the grating of Yu et al. been further

characterized in its transmission characteristics, it too would have exhibited the high extinction ratios reported by Applicants.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee Fineman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAF
February 13, 2006

DREW A. DUNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER